UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/570,823	03/06/2006	Peter Schmidkonz	A9957	A9957 7086	
20741 7590 06/22/2010 HOFFMAN WASSON & GITLER, P.C					
CRYSTAL CEI	NTER 2, SUITE 522		MUSSER, BARBARA J		
	CLARK STREET VA 22202-3843		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
			1791		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			06/22/2010	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Commence		10/570,823	SCHMIDKONZ, PETER				
Office Action Sum	mary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		BARBARA J. MUSSER	1791				
The MAILING DATE of this Period for Reply	s communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	ddress			
after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing dat  If NO period for reply is specified above, the Failure to reply within the set or extended p	M THE MAILING DA the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 e of this communication. e maximum statutory period w eriod for reply will, by statute, hree months after the mailing		N. nely filed the mailing date of this c D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1) Responsive to communica	tion(s) filed on 02 Fe	hruary 2010					
2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> .	· · ·	action is non-final.					
′ <del>=</del>	<i>,</i> —		secution as to the	e merits is			
· · ·	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims							
4)	is/are withdraw lowed. ed. cted to.						
Application Papers							
9)☐ The specification is objecte	d to by the Examiner						
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request the	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>							
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	- P (PTO 6 15)	4) Interview Summary					
<ol> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawir</li> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (F Paper No(s)/Mail Date</li> </ol>		Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5)  Notice of Informal P 6) Other:					

Art Unit: 1791

## **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 6/2/10 has been entered.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
   The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 3. Claims 2 -17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
- 4. Claim 2 recites the limitation "the respective transversal slot" in line 5. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is unclear if these transversal slots are part of the perforating tool or part of the resulting cut line.

Regarding claim 3, it is unclear how "processing of the folding or sheet edges is performed according to a perforating device" as the perforating device does not fold. It is unclear how the perforating device can be made of two symmetrical halves when symmetrical means corresponding in size shape and relative position on opposite sides of a dividing line. For the purposes of examination, this is considered to require the two

halves to be the same shape but offset from each other so the teeth are not symmetric about the dividing line.

Regarding claim 4 and 5, it is unclear if the punching lines of the punching tool form the perforations of claim 1 as there is no indication of what the punching tool of claims 4 and 5 does in claim 1. It is noted in claim 3, the punching tool is called a perforating device. It is suggested applicant use the same language to refer to the same elements throughout the claims. It is unclear if the punching lines are the teeth of the tool or the shapes cut into the sheet.

Regarding claim 6, it is unclear what the claim adds to claim 1 as claim 1 requires folding along the perforation, indicating the two halves must still be connected to one another. It is unclear if the transversal webs of this claim are the same as the transversal slots of claim 2 as both appear to refer to the same element, e.g. the cut lines in the sheet. It is suggested applicant use the same language to refer to the same elements throughout the claims.

Regarding claim 7, it is unclear exactly what is occurring as claim 1 indicates there are two perforation lines while claim 7 refers to only one perforation line, particularly considering that claim 7 suggests the two perforations lines are actually only one line with hinge points.

Regarding claim 8, it is unclear if the pockets are related to the perforation lines or are separate from them.

Regarding claim 10, it is unclear what this claim means as it is unclear what "transient positions" are and what "recesses" are being referred to.

Art Unit: 1791

Regarding claim 11, it is unclear what is meant by "the distance of the two perforation lines of the widened folding edge is altered". For the purposes of examination, this is assumed to mean the distance between the two perforation lines is altered.

5. Claim 12 recites the limitation "the transversal lines" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Regarding claim 13, it is unclear if this claim requires the absence of a gap between the perforation teeth as it is not in the claim, but is in the method claim this apparatus claim is dependent from.

Regarding claim 14, it is unclear if the transversal slots are part of the perforation tool or part of the cuts in the sheets.

Regarding claim 15, it is unclear how the longitudinally extending parts can only partly cut the material and yet perforate it so that it is cut through.

Regarding claim 16, it is unclear if the transversal webs of this claim are the same as the transversal slots of claim 2 as both appear to refer to the same element, e.g. the cut lines in the sheet. It is suggested applicant use the same language to refer to the same elements throughout the claims.

# Allowable Subject Matter

- 6. Claims 1 and 18 are allowed.
- 7. Claims 2-17 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 1791

8. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the prior art of record does not teach or fairly suggest a method of connecting sheets together wherein two perforation lines are punched in a sheet which are staggered by the length of a perforating tooth and have no gaps between the punched out areas of the perforation lines. As claim 13 is dependent on claim 1, it is considered to require this feature as well.

#### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BARBARA J. MUSSER whose telephone number is (571)272-1222. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday; alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Crispino can be reached on (571)-272-1226. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

Art Unit: 1791

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

BJM /B. J. M./ Examiner, Art Unit 1791

/Richard Crispino/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1791